

1 CHRISTOPHER CHIOU  
2 Acting United States Attorney  
3 District of Nevada  
4 Nevada Bar Number 14853  
5 RANDOLPH J. ST. CLAIR  
6 Assistant United States Attorney  
7 RICHARD B. CASPER  
8 Assistant United States Attorney  
9 Nevada Bar Number 8980  
10 400 South Virginia Street, Suite 900  
11 Reno, Nevada 89501  
12 Phone: 775-784-5438  
13 [Randy.StClair@usdoj.gov](mailto:Randy.StClair@usdoj.gov)  
14 [Richard.Casper@usdoj.gov](mailto:Richard.Casper@usdoj.gov)

15 *Representing the United States of America*

16  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 WILLIAM PHILLIP NEIDINGER,  
23 aka "William Joseph Beck III,"

24 Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-CR-00009-HDM-CLB

**Government's Sentencing  
Memorandum**

17 **I. Introduction**

18 On December 15, 2021, after a three-day jury trial, Defendant, William Phillip  
19 Neidinger, was found guilty of the charge False Statements in Application for a U.S.  
20 Passport, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1542, as charged in Count One of the superseding  
21 indictment. ECF No. 84.

22 The government agrees with Probation's recommendation of a 14-month sentence  
23 of incarceration for the reasons set forth herein.

1           **II.     Factual background**

2           This facts and evidence in this case were put before the Court and the jury during  
3 the trial starting on December 13, 2021, and ending on December 15, 2021. In summary,  
4 Defendant unlawfully used another person's information in a 2018 U.S. passport  
5 application to try to get a new passport after he was denied a passport renewal in his true  
6 name in 2017 due to owing a large amount of child support arrearage. As alleged in the  
7 superseding information, the false statements Defendant made on the 2018 U.S. passport  
8 application were the use of a Social Security number that was not his own, a date of birth  
9 that was not his date of birth, and a place of birth that was not Defendant's true place of  
10 birth. (Defendant was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, but he used Little Rock, Arkansas as his  
11 place of birth on the 2018 U.S. passport application.)

12           Finally, with some very minor exceptions that can be addressed at sentencing, the  
13 government agrees with the facts as presented in the Presentence Investigation Report  
14 ("PSR").

15           **III.    Discussion**

16           The goal of sentencing is to "'impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than  
17 necessary' to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and  
18 provide just punishment; to afford adequate deterrence; to protect the public; and to  
19 provide the defendant with needed . . . correctional treatment." *United States v. Carry*, 520  
20 F.3d 984, 991 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)). The Court considers "the  
21 nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the  
22 defendant," "the need for the sentence imposed," "the kinds of sentences available," the  
23 applicable sentencing guideline range, any pertinent policy statement, sentences imposed  
24

1 on other similarly situated defendants, and the need for victim restitution. 18 U.S.C. §  
2 3553(a). The defendant's conduct warrants a guideline sentence to further these goals.

3 **a. The Sentencing Guideline Range**

4 The government agrees with Pretrial Services guideline calculation of 10.  
5 Defendant's base offense level is 8. USSG §2L2.2(a). For different reasons other than those  
6 noted by probation, there should also be an adjustment for Obstruction of Justice.

7 **1. Mr. Neidinger Obstructed Justice by Evading and/or Refusing to Answer  
8 Questions During the Cross-Examination Portion of His Testimony.**

9 Defendant willfully obstructed or impeded, or attempted to obstruct or impede, the  
10 administration of justice with respect to the prosecution of the instant offense of conviction,  
11 and the obstructive conduct related to the defendant's offense of conviction and any relevant  
12 conduct; or a closely related offense; therefore, two levels should be added. USSG § 3C1.1.

13 The government's reasoning for the additional two levels for obstruction are  
14 different than the reasons iterated in the PSR. The government position is that the basis for  
15 an obstruction enhancement is related to Defendant's behavior and statements made while  
16 he was testifying at trial, specifically, some of the statements and answers by Defendant  
17 during cross-examination by the government. After being fully advised of his right to  
18 remain silent, and after being advised by the Court of what waiving that right would mean,  
19 in particular, that he would be subject to cross-examination by the government if he chose  
20 to testify in his own defense, Defendant chose to be non-responsive, evasive, and/or  
21 refused to answer questions properly posed by the government during cross-examination.  
22 This occurred in some cases even after being specifically directed by the Court to answer  
23 certain questions. *See generally*, December 14, 2021, Transcript of Trial Testimony of  
24 Defendant Neidinger ("Transcript") pp. 61-70.

1 Some relevant examples taken from the Transcript of Defendant's cross-  
2 examination are below.

3 **Testimony related to Exhibit 11, Defendant's birth  
certificate—Questions by Mr. St. Clair:**

5 Q: Okay. So it has your name on it, correct, William  
6 Phillip Neidinger?

7 A: Same answer.

8 Q: That's your name?

9 A: Under those circumstances, yes.

10 Q: And date of birth July 15, 1961. Yes or no.

11 A: Same answer.

12 Q: But this is your birth certificate.

13 A: Same answer.

14 Q And were your parents -- was one of your parents' maiden  
15 name Phyllis Hilda Stoltenberg that is now Ms. Phyllis Hilda  
16 Neidinger after she was married? Is that your mother?

17 A Yep, under -- the same answer as before.

18 THE COURT: The question is, is that your mother.

19 THE WITNESS: Same answer as before.

20 Transcript at pp. 61-62.

21 **Testimony Related to Defendant's Use of Another Person's  
date of birth—Questions by Mr. St. Clair:**

23 Q: You knew it was another person's date of birth, correct?

24 A: Same answer.

1 Q: And you knew it was another person's --

2 THE COURT: You can answer that one yes or no. Did you  
3 know that that was somebody else's identity and place of birth  
4 and --

5 THE WITNESS: It's not that simple. If it was --

6 THE COURT: Well, are you refusing to answer the question?

7 THE WITNESS: I am refusing to give more of an answer.

8 *Id.* at pp. 63-64.

9 **Testimony Related to Defendant's same-day use of**  
10 **California and Nevada EBT cards, under the Beck identity**  
11 **and his true name, respectively—Questions by Mr. St. Clair**  
12 **after Defendant's objection was overruled:**

13 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. He did refer to these  
14 benefits, and he also referred to securing foods and things to  
15 sustain himself. So it's proper cross-examination. You may go  
16 ahead, and I'm directing you to answer the questions.

17 THE WITNESS: I refuse to answer transaction by transaction.

18 *Id.* at pp. 69.

19 After the Court indicated that Defendant's refusal to answer in the above instance would  
20 be addressed outside the presence of the jury, the government again asked Defendant a  
21 question about his use of the EBT cards but with more specifics:

22 BY MR. ST. CLAIR:

23 Q: So I want to be clear that you're saying you don't want to  
24 answer the question that is you, on May -- on specifically May  
30th of 2018, you swiped, first of all, your -- one of your

1                   benefits cards under the Beck name at the Whole Foods, and it  
2                   didn't work, correct? Yes or no.

3                   A: If I was going to answer that, I'd say I can't remember,  
4                   but I'm not answering it.

5                   *Id.*

6                   This line of questioning briefly continued with Defendant answering the same thing; that  
7                   if he was going to answer, he'd say he can't remember, and then saying, "but I'm not  
8                   answering it." *Id.* at p. 70.

9                   These were some of the more egregious examples of Defendant's attitude and  
10                  refusal to submit to cross-examination. After the Court allowed Defendant a great deal of  
11                  leeway in his narrative and direct testimony to the jury—he decided he did not want to  
12                  answer specific questions on cross-examination that were within the scope of his direct  
13                  testimony, even when directed to do so by the Court. Defendant refused to comply with  
14                  the Court's orders and directions regarding how cross-examination would proceed.  
15                  Defendant was well-advised by the Court regarding his rights to remain silent and the  
16                  rights he was waiving if he did choose to testify—one of which was that he would be  
17                  subject to cross-examination by the government.

18                  Defendant's evasion and refusal to answer questions after being directed to do so  
19                  by the Court is similar to trials where a co-conspirator has been granted immunity, is fully  
20                  advised as to what that means, and is ordered by the court to testify and then refuses to  
21                  testify. Such a refusal constitutes obstruction of justice under USSG § 3C.1. *United States v.*  
22                  *Morales*, 977 F.2d 1330, 1331 (9th Cir. 1992).

23                  In *Morales*, the defendant pled guilty to conspiracy to distribute and possession with  
24                  intent to distribute cocaine, but he refused to testify in the trial of his co-conspirators after

1 he was granted testimonial immunity and *ordered to testify by the district court*. *Id.* (emphasis  
2 added) “Morales’ refusal to testify constituted a willful obstruction of, or at least an  
3 attempt to obstruct, the administration of justice during the prosecution of [his co-  
4 conspirators].” *Id.*; *see also United States v. Acuna*, 9 F.3d 1442, 1446 (9th Cir. 1993) (The  
5 obstruction enhancement applies “when a defendant attempts to obstruct justice in a case  
6 closely related to his own, such as that of a codefendant.”). In the present case, Defendant  
7 didn’t just attempt to obstruct in a case “closely related to his own” but in his own case.  
8 Defendant received the benefit of telling his side of the story to the jury, in mostly  
9 narrative form, and then when the government tried to test Defendant’s testimony with  
10 impeachment evidence, he chose the path of evasion and refusal even after admonishment  
11 by the Court. In essence, if Defendant heard a question from the government that didn’t fit  
12 his version of events, he became evasive and/or nonresponsive, or would just refuse to  
13 answer. This behavior at trial was a clear attempt by Defendant to obstruct the  
14 administration of justice—an improper effort to make sure the jury only heard his version  
15 of events without a proper test of an unhindered cross-examination by the government.  
16 For all of the above reasons, a two-level increase for obstruction should be applied.

17 The government agrees with the probation that Defendant’s criminal history  
18 category is III and his guideline range is 10 to 16 months.

19 **b. Section 3553(a) Factors**

20 The section 3553(a) factors support a 14-month sentence of incarceration. This  
21 sentence would provide just punishment for the crime committed, deter the defendant and  
22 others from similar criminal conduct, and protect the public. Anything below a guideline  
23 sentence would not adequately reflect the seriousness of this offense.

1       Defendant has remained unrepentant and does not seem to believe that what he did  
2 was inherently wrong. He has shown no empathy for the consequences that his actions  
3 might have regarding Mr. Beck's future ability to get his own legal U.S. passport renewed.  
4 Based on Defendant's recent pleadings, his Petition for Travel for Family Need (ECF No.  
5 127) and his Sentencing Memorandum (ECF No. 129), it is apparent that he sees nothing  
6 wrong with his actions and behavior that led to his indictment and his ultimate conviction  
7 in this case—in fact, Defendant is still blaming others for the choices he made and the  
8 problems he created for himself.

9       Furthermore, it is in the national security interest of the United States to jealously  
10 guard against fraud related to the issuance of U.S. passports. As was stated by one of the  
11 government's witnesses from Consular Affairs, Fraud Program Manager, Myrna  
12 Gutierrez, the U.S. passport is the “gold standard” of identification because of the United  
13 States' reputation in the world, and the fact that a U.S. passport confirms identification  
14 and U.S. Citizenship upon the bearer of a valid U.S. passport. A guideline sentence of 14  
15 months is necessary to deter this conduct and protect the public.

16       Finally, Defendant now has California and Nevada cases pending in state and  
17 municipal courts. While the charges alleged in those cases are not based on behavior that  
18 occurred while he was on pretrial release in the present case, these are cases related to the  
19 alleged frauds he committed that were part and parcel to this case. Defendant so far has  
20 not been held to account and even with his pending state charges, he has given no  
21 indication that he intends to change his behavior for the better. He blames the government  
22 for his recent conviction and blames others in general for his past problems and his child  
23 support debt. But it is Defendant's own actions and choices that have caused his  
24 problems—nonetheless, he seems to still believe everything that has happened to him is the

1 fault of others. A guideline sentence is appropriate based upon the facts of this case,  
2 Defendant's history, and his seeming inability to take responsibility for his own actions.

3 **IV. Supervised Release**

4 The government agrees with Probation's recommendation for three years of  
5 supervised release as well as the special conditions recommended for supervised release.  
6 The search and seizure under reasonable suspicion condition is justified by the defendant's  
7 actions and the facts of this case. Without this search condition, the defendant will have  
8 greater opportunity to anticipate searches and conceal criminality, which would directly  
9 undermine the goals of deterrence and protection of the public. 18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(d)(1),  
10 3553(a).

11 **V. Conclusion**

12 Based on the foregoing, the government respectfully requests the Court impose a  
13 14-month sentence of imprisonment. Based on the totality of circumstances, this sentence  
14 is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the §3553 factors.

15 DATED: April 14, 2022.

16  
17 Respectfully submitted,

18  
19 CHRISTOPHER CHIOU  
Acting United States Attorney

20  
21 /s/ Randolph J. St. Clair

22 RANDOLPH J. ST. CLAIR  
23 Assistant United States Attorney